



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ANOTHER WORD ON THE DIETARY LAWS.

IN the form of a Critical Notice of the late Dr. Wiener's *Die jüdischen Speisegesetze*, there appeared in the April Number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW a truculent attack on the Jewish Dietary Laws by Mr. C. G. Montefiore. The writer's active participation in philanthropic and social movements within and without the Jewish community, his zealous pursuit and generous encouragement of Jewish science and the not-to-be-despised gift of a graceful style confer a title to consideration upon everything that proceeds from his pen. The article in question demands especial notice. For the topic it discusses is not of an academic character—the elucidation of an obscure point in philology or archaeology—but one fraught with living interest to every son and daughter of Israel. The Dietary Laws form an important and considerable section of that Institutional element which constitutes at present the main difference between Judaism and other creeds, and which must be justified if the maintenance of Judaism as a separate creed is to be defended. The Monotheistic dogma has been assimilated by Islam completely, and by Christendom in a modified form. The maligned Schulchan Aruch regards the doctrine of the Trinity in the Christian faith, not as Polytheism, but as qualified Unitarianism. The morality of Israel's prophets has long since become the common property of all civilized peoples. As missionaries of doctrine and ethical teachers the Jews have been outstripped in the race by the Moslem and Christian. The latter are the bearers of the light to the heathens. If the Hebrew has resisted absorption, and Israel is still "a people dwelling alone and not to be

counted among the nations," it is because of the strong hold Institutionalism has upon him¹. The preservation of his distinct individuality is largely due to the observance of the Dietary Laws. By his onslaught on these, Mr. Montefiore has incurred a heavy responsibility. He has played into the hands of the anti-Semites who have in recent years made the Schechita a *Tagesfrage* in France, Prussia, Bohemia, Moravia, and Switzerland. He has provided weak-kneed adherents with a salve for their conscience, a lame excuse for ridding themselves of the last encumbering shreds of the faith in which they were born.

It would be too sanguine to expect that Mr. Montefiore will surrender his views. The modest object of this Reply is to defend the logical character of the traditional interpretation of the Dietary Laws and at the same time to point out to the assailants how untenable is their own position, that they either go too far or not far enough.

¹ To avoid misapprehension, I should like to say that the purpose of the above remarks is not to disparage the importance of the Monotheistic dogma in Judaism, but to save the rest of that system from being overshadowed by its single creed or swamped by mere *Schwärmerei*. Abstract theological propositions are, by themselves, sterile and futile. Their value consists in their furnishing either a firm basis for conduct or a powerful spring to action. Belief has been well defined as *readiness to act*. If the duties of the intellect and heart are the vital force of Judaism, "practical duties" are its backbone. The Jewish, like other Oriental religions, regulates the whole of life, not one side of it, and disciplines all the faculties of mind—the will, the emotions, and the intellect. The *Shemang* accordingly opens with the declaration of the Unity of God, addressed to the reason. The next verse is an appeal to the heart for love and devotion to the Almighty. The emphasis of the paragraph, however, is to be found in the weighty peroration which enjoins practical instruction in the Torah and such ceremonials as Tephillin and Mezuzah. Those who advocate the abrogation of ceremonies in Judaism ignore Israel's character as a kingdom of priests with priestly duties and obligations. What they term the spiritualization of the creed resolves itself for many into vague emotions and morals divorced from the discipline of the Law. Their efforts, if generally successful, would reduce the religion of Israel to an impalpable, indefinite entity, bearing a close analogy to those gaseous products of the chemist's retort, which may be exceedingly aromatic, but which rapidly exhale and evaporate.

Mr. Montefiore remarks that "it is impossible for persons of culture to keep the Dietary Laws." "The Jewish Dietary Laws are a bit of Asia in Europe which can never prosper in their new environment. They belong to a stage of religious custom which, for all civilized persons, has passed away" (p. 393). According to this statement, then, not only must millions of Jews in past centuries who faithfully observed the Dietary Laws, and their equally numerous descendants who follow in their footsteps, be excluded from the pale of civilization, but the great Jewish thinkers, exegetists and grammarians, poets and philosophers, must also be denied the claim to culture. Maimonides, the brilliant jurist, physician, and psychologist; Ibn Ezra, astronomer, mathematician, and commentator; Jehuda Halevi, the Poet of Castile; Solomon ibn Gebirol, universally admired in the middle ages under the name of Avicébron, must all have been devoid of culture. For these lights and leaders, in spite of the wide sweep and freedom of their bold speculations, and the lofty flights of their soaring imaginations, were, in practice, respecters of the authority of tradition, and scrupulously observed the Dietary Laws, as also did Moses Mendelssohn, pioneer and representative of the Renaissance of secular learning among the Jews of Germany at the close of the eighteenth century.

It is not the Biblical enactments but their Rabbinical interpretations against which the writer directs his fiercest diatribes. "It is a crying necessity of the times that the Rabbinic developments of the Dietary Laws should be authoritatively removed" (p. 395). The reason given for the alleged necessity is passing strange. These regulations are to be abrogated not because otherwise conscientious and sincere Israelites have complained of their difficulty and burdensomeness, but "because they are disobeyed from carelessness or indifference or convenience." Can any rationalization be more inept? Accept the laxity of the indifferent as a standard of conduct and not a single religious observance will survive. The Sabbath is violated by

jobbers and brokers who prefer the boisterous excitement of the Kaffir and Westralian markets, with their chances of profit, to the decorous calm of the synagogue and home services. The transgression of the fourth commandment is due, in their case, to nothing but carelessness, indifference, and convenience. Hence it is the clear duty of the ecclesiastical authorities to abrogate the institution of the seventh-day Sabbath, or at least its Rabbinical development, and authoritatively to sanction Saturday attendance to business by Jews. The Abrahamic rite is a strange oriental custom; it should, therefore, be dropped as out of harmony with European culture. In this way, every institution of Judaism would go by the board. The truth is that the experiment of making concessions to the indifferentists has not hitherto been attended with brilliant success. This class of nominal Jews neither experience the need of authoritative abrogation, nor do they wait for it. Mr. Montefiore dolefully asks, "How long is Judaism to contain strange customs which its own adherents, as soon as they are Europeanized, begin to throw aside?" (p. 396). The assertion, made in good faith, is based on too limited an experience. For Mr. Montefiore's hundreds or even thousands of indifferentists, there are millions who cling with heart and soul and might to the traditional observances. The hope and future of Judaism rest not on that inconsiderable section who rebel against the discipline of their creed as a galling yoke and who, sooner or later, leave the community, but on the bulk of Israel who cheerfully make sacrifices for their faith. For them the Law of God is perfect, enduring for ever, and certainly of higher account than European culture. They obey the precepts of the Law because they regard them as orders of the Great Captain issued to His hosts, whose business it is not to argue about them, but to learn and understand and do them. Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do—and live. The motive for obedience is the Divine origin of these laws. Their ultimate purpose is man's

welfare here and hereafter. And this distinction between motive and purpose sufficiently disposes, I think, of the contention that "the Dietary Laws in their origin, and probably in their development, had nothing to do (except unconsciously) with self-control or with sanitation" (pp. 394, 395)—a statement, which, as it stands, is easily refuted. The answer to its first half may be given in a single text. "Only be strong and firm not to eat blood," is surely an injunction to self-restraint. Every religious restriction obviously fosters the virtue of self-control. The second half, reiterated later on in a more general form,— "The founders and developers of the Dietary Laws did not confound religion with hygiene" (p. 395),—flies in the face of the numerous hygienic regulations of the Pentateuch, the religious character of which is undeniable. The reward promised for obedience to God's commandments is physical health and material prosperity. "If thou wilt listen to my commandments, it will be well with thee and thou wilt live long." "If thou wilt listen to the voice of the Lord thy God, all the diseases which I have sent upon the Egyptians, I will not send upon thee, for I, the Lord, am thy physician." In a theocratic constitution regulations to secure public health are necessarily a part of religion. It argues ignorance of the spirit of Judaism to speak of a confusion between hygiene and religion when the former is subsumed under the latter. Of the close connexion between the two the Rabbis were fully conscious when they laid down the principle חמירה חמירה מאדורא.

A remark of the writer's to which objection may properly be taken is one like the following: "A determining superstition was this, that certain kinds of physical cleanliness and uncleanness are of vast importance from the point of view of religion and personal safety" (p. 394). The sentence is quoted *in extenso*, because it is so astounding that condensation would not have done justice to it. That personal cleanliness plays an important part in the economy

of Judaism is readily conceded. Baptism is a Jewish rite; washing of the hands and feet and entire body, scrupulous cleanliness of person, clothing, dwelling, and all utensils, are frequently enjoined in Bible, Talmud, and Schulchan Aruch.

Physical cleanliness is an essential of moral purity of which it is a type. The saying, "Cleanliness is next to godliness," has been anticipated in the memorable aphorism (end of Kiddushin), "R. Pinchas b. Jair, says physical cleanliness leads to purity of mind and soul, and these are necessary antecedents to fitness for the reception of the Holy Spirit." The Essenes, according to Graetz, derive their name from their practice of frequent ablutions. A Jewish sect is termed טובלי שחרית, *Hemerobaptistai*, because one of their religious exercises was daily baptism. No further illustrations are needed of the supreme importance Judaism attaches to cleanliness. But why should this passion for physical purity be branded as a superstition? Is the mediaeval anchorite's penchant for dirt a nobler trait? One might almost suspect that the condemnation of cleanliness was influenced by a semi-conscious reminiscence of Jesus' defence of his disciples who neglected to wash their hands (Matt. xv. 2-20). But Jesus is not accepted as an exponent of Judaism. And Christian theologians have been at pains to explain away that episode in the life of their Master¹.

Another passage that must arouse considerable astonish-

¹ The writer's remark might possibly refer to the separation in ancient times from unclean people that this scrupulous regard to cleanliness inevitably involves. The value and justification of these rules of separation is demonstrated in an article by an English army doctor on a similar system that obtains in India at the present day (see the *Nineteenth Century* for October, 1896: "The Cholera Goddess"). The objectionable feature that plays so large a part in the Indian system of hygiene, viz. caste of birth, was unknown among the Jews. The Chaberim, who formed voluntary associations for the scrupulous observance of the biblical laws of purity, belonged to all sections of the people, learned and unlearned, rich and poor. Every one could become a Chaber, if he consented to conform to the rules of the association.

ment is the following: "The Dietary Laws were a part and parcel of the popular religion to which the prophets were opposed. The people could only be won over to the doctrines of the prophets by casting the aegis of orthodoxy over a mass of popular customs and superstitions. Hence the ceremonial law, as we have it in the Pentateuch" (p. 395).

Here, there are two propositions for which not a shred of evidence is adduced. First, that the Dietary Laws, like the rest of the Ceremonial Law in the Pentateuch, are a mass of superstition. Second, that the prophets, at first opposed to them, at length adopted them to win adherents for their own religious principles.

Samuel angry with Saul and the people for eating the flesh of sheep "with the blood"¹; Isaiah inveighing against those who "eat the flesh of the swine, the abominable thing, and the mouse"²; Ezekiel, who claims that he never violated the Dietary Laws³, were all forsooth merely playing a part. They spread the aegis of orthodoxy over superstitions which in time became so firmly rooted in the conscience of the nation that for their sake Daniel and the three children refused to partake of the king's banquet in the Babylonian Court⁴; the Maccabean heroes revolted against Antiochus' tyranny, and Eleazar, the old man of ninety, voluntarily suffered a martyr's death. This superstition is so universally respected that even the Karaite, who has discarded the authority of tradition, still scrupulously observes the minutiae of *Schechitah* and *Melichah*! Is it credible that the prophets were, in their hearts, opposed to these observances? Will any one believe that the fiery and fearless men of God who, in the cause of justice and truth, spared neither priest nor prince nor people, who denounced the grasping greed of the rich oppressor that ground the face of the poor, and "added

¹ 1 Sam. xiv. 32.

² Isa. lxvi. 17.

³ Ezek. iv. 14.

⁴ Dan. i. 8-20.

house to house till there was no room in the land," who derided formalism devoid of righteousness: will any one believe that these men were so mealy-mouthed and poor-spirited, such cowards and hypocrites, as to compound with their consciences and compromise with what they were convinced was wrong. An Elijah who perilled his life in his life-long fight against Jezebel's idolatry, and would tolerate no "trimming" in religion, who cried out to the nation "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord is God, serve him; but if Baal, then serve him¹;" a Jeremiah who was lowered into the dungeon because he was not afraid to utter truths unpalatable to the court, and who asked: "What has straw to do with wheat?"—were these and their colleagues the men to mix up the precious grain, after it had been laboriously winnowed, with the worthless chaff, deliberately to mingle truth and falsehood? The supposition is an absurd self-contradiction.

The prophets attacked lapses from the high standard of Mosaic ethics. But they never treated Mosaic ceremonials with levity. They came to confirm the Law, not to destroy it. The last of the prophets concludes his exhortation with the monition: "Remember ye the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb²." In the Pentateuch no division is drawn between ethics and ceremonials. The nineteenth chapter of Leviticus mingles the loftiest ethical rules with the minutest ceremonial details of the most heterogeneous description, and the heading of the whole chapter is: "Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God am holy."

The sneers about the Almighty revealing to Moses the proper mode of slaughtering sheep and oxen, and the strictures on the Rabbinical interpretation of *Nevelah* and *Terefah*, are spent arrows, that fall harmlessly. To the Infinite and All-Compassionate the health and happiness of his creatures, whether human beings or brutes, is

¹ 1 Kings xviii. 21.

² Mal. iv. 4.

certainly not trivial. If Schechitah is the most humane mode of slaughtering cattle¹, and the Jewish Bedikah the most thorough and efficient system of examination of carcasses, ensuring to the observant Jew wholesome food, there is nothing derogatory in the conception that Schechitah and Bedikah are ordained by Divine appointment. The doctrine of Monotheism, the ordinance of the Sabbath, the sanctity of the life, honour, property, and good repute of our neighbours, in fine, the entire Moral Law did not need a specific Revelation. The human intellect was equal to the task of discovering these necessary foundations of a stable society. If revelation were at all required, it was to teach us ceremonials and rites which lie outside ordinary experience, and the knowledge of which the finite human mind could never have independently attained to instruct us in the duty of man to God, to himself, and to our dumb friends.

That the Dietary Laws are neglected in some quarters need not fill our souls with alarm for the continuance of Judaism. To live up to a high standard of religion is difficult. In the days of the Judges and Kings, the abandonment, by many, of the service of God for the worship of Baal and Ashtaroath, and Chemosh, did not destroy Judaism; and it will certainly not perish because their descendants at the present day mingle among the nations and copy their ways. Every effort should be made to retain and reclaim the indifferent, but not at the sacrifice of principle. The best interests of the Jewish religion are certainly not served by trimming our sails to catch each passing breeze of opinion, and sanctioning the laxity of those who do not wait for and do not require Rabbinical authority to do what seems good in their own eyes.

“We can regard the Dietary Laws as mere sanitary enactments. Well, even if they are this, let us observe them as such, and not injure religion by giving them a false

¹ There is a vast literature on this subject. Reference may be made most profitably to Dembo's *Jewish Method of Slaughtering*, pp. 98, 99.

that to repudiate its teachings would cause a shock, and provoke reaction. It is safer far to gird at the Rabbinical developments which have already served as a target for attack. Demolish the latter and the former will crumble away of their own accord. But the plan is fore-doomed to failure. The so-called reformers of Judaism who have repudiated the authority of tradition are not a disciplined army, but a confused rabble without cohesion or solidarity. They do not keep in line. Each of them is a law to himself and frames his own religious code. The attempt to throw over Rabbinism has been repeatedly made—and with what result? Let history speak. The Sadducees who seceded from the main body have perished, and left no trace behind them. The Karaites have survived. But what a sorry spectacle does their ritualism—rigid to absurdity—present? Their interpretation of the commandment “Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation on the Sabbath day¹,” forces them to sit in the cold and dark on the long winter evenings. It has, however, to be remembered, as has already been noted, that the Karaites observe the laws of Schechitah as strictly as the Rabbinites. It is not my province to enter upon a set defence and detailed justification of the Rabbinical interpretations of the Dietary Laws. To do justice to them would require the profound and varied acquirements of a Dembo. Only one as versed as he is in Talmud and Medicine could expound scientifically the Hilchot Terefoth in the masterly manner in which he has demonstrated the utility and wisdom of the Hilchot Schechitah². But the fallacies in some of Mr. Montefiore’s strictures lie so obviously on the surface that the most ordinary intelligence cannot miss them. He attacks, for example, the Jewish mode of washing and salting the meat, which, he says, deprives it of a large proportion of

¹ Exod. xxxv. 3.

² See Dembo’s *Jewish Method of Slaughter* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1894), passim.

its nutrient value. We would request Mr. Montefiore to visit a slaughter-house and examine the cloth with which the interiors of the carcasses are rubbed down; to visit butchers' shops in poor neighbourhoods, where the air reeks with foul fumes, and where the raw, bleeding surface of beef and mutton is exposed for hours to miasmatic influences,—and he will appreciate the wise regulation that, before being prepared for human consumption, meat must be washed and salted,—not as Mr. Montefiore alleges, “to deprive it of every driblet of blood,” but merely to remove the stagnant, impure, diseased, germ-laden, surface blood. Nor is it absolutely essential that meat should be soaked in water for half-an-hour and salted for an hour; grilling on the live coals for a few minutes serves the same purpose, and is sufficient.

Wiener quotes an opinion that the excessive washing and salting of the meat leads to diseases of the intestines among the Jews. I have been at some pains to obtain confirmation of this allegation, but, up to the present, without success. No medical man whom I have consulted has heard of the special prevalence of this class of maladies among his Jewish patients. It was, moreover, pointed out to me that sailors and marines in our royal and merchant navies live for months at a time on salt junket. And yet intestinal diseases are not markedly noticeable among this class of our population. That salt extracts a portion of nourishment is undeniable. But it acts as a powerful antiseptic, destroying disease-germs and rendering the flesh on which it is sprinkled sweet and wholesome. The gain in the immunity it secures the Jewish people from disease far more than counterbalances the loss of nutrient elements¹.

¹ On the superior vitality of the Jews, admittedly due, to a large extent, to the observance of the Dietary Laws, there is a large number of Articles in the Medical Press, here and abroad, which may be traced in Neale's *Medical Digest*. Mr. Marcus Adler's paper on the *Health Laws of the Bible and their influence upon the life condition of the Jews*, is valuable for its statistics.

"The examination of the carcasses is often inadequate. Dr. Phillipson admitted that the distinguishing marks of healthy and forbidden, laid down by the Rabbis, can no longer hold water" (p. 400). I will only pause for a moment to note that, as Dr. Phillipson did not belong to the orthodox party, his statement as to the inadequacy of the Rabbinical regulations for the examination of carcasses is not the admission of a friend but the assertion of an opponent, which ought not to be accepted without proof. But even granting for the sake of argument that he is right, surely an inadequate examination is better than none at all. It secures the rejection of a large proportion of diseased meat, while all the efforts of the official inspectors cannot prevent the sale and consumption of meat which, on the testimony of unbiassed experts, ought to have been condemned as carrion¹. It would be an excellent thing for the health of the general community if the "inadequate" Jewish mode of examination were universally adopted. The risk of the communication of tuberculosis and other diseases from brutes to human beings would be considerably diminished.

"In any case, should a minister of religion decide whether meat is fit or unfit for human food? The relegation of such questions to a minister, as a part of his religious duties, would be farcical, were it not so sad" (p. 400). This is a question which admits of discussion. What holier function can any individual exercise than that of ministering to the health of the community? Did not the priests in ancient times decide as to the symptoms of leprosy? Were not those shining lights of Judaism, the Aristotelian Maimonides and the Cabbalist Nachmanides, practising physicians? The duty of slaughtering animals has a tendency to brutalize those who take part in it. Who are more likely to discharge this function with humanity and consideration—coarse, callous yokels

¹ Behrend, "Diseases caught from Butchers' Meat," in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, 1889, p. 411, quotation from the *Glasgow Herald*.

or men of knowledge and refinement? The examination of carcasses for disease is a delicate and responsible duty, on which the health of an entire community depends, and not to be lightly entrusted to any one.

"The words of Scripture are twisted to find Biblical authority for the Talmudic enactments" (p. 400). The first example of this "bouleversement" is the prohibition of the sinew of the hind quarters. Mr. Montefiore renders the text in Genesis "Therefore the children of Israel *eat* not of the sinew of the hip." They *shall not* eat is, to his mind, a grammatical impossibility. I should like to know why. In Hebrew, as in English, the future is used in an imperative sense, as every tyro who reads the Decalogue knows. And even if the text does not enunciate a rule but simply recites a custom, a scholar like Mr. Montefiore need not be reminded of the legal principle "*Inveterata consuetudo pro lege non immerito custoditur*¹." Where a uniform usage commends itself to the consciousness of the people, it is law. "*Mos legis vicem sustinet.*" It is nowhere recorded that at any period in Jewish history the custom in question has been abrogated.

"Salting and Schechita are pure figments and inventions of the Rabbis, without any Scriptural basis" (p. 401). A bold statement, unsupported by a shadow of proof. All the weight of evidence runs counter to it. The radicals שחט and הרג are not synonymous. The exclusive use of the former term in connexion with sacrifices surely points to a definite and prescribed mode of slaughter. As early as the times of the New Testament a beast not slaughtered in the lawful mode was termed *πνικτός*, "strangled." If the Rock of the Church was vouchsafed a vision which he interpreted as a permission to Christians to partake of what had been previously forbidden, surely the Jews have not the right to avail themselves of this dispensation.

¹ Digest I. 3. 32; Dig. xxi. 1. 31. 20; Cod. 8. 53. 2; cp. the strong expression of Aristotle in Pol. II, 5: ὁ γὰρ νόμος ἰσχύει οὐδεμίαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ πείθεσθαι πλὴν παρὰ τὸ ἔθος, quoted in Moyle's *Justinian*, Notes, pp. 98, 99.

The writer falls foul of the Talmud for its extension of the terms Nevelah and Terefah to include animals that had been slaughtered without Schechitah or were found to have suffered from mortal disease. This he calls an "absolute inversion of the meaning of the text" (p. 401). Here, again, I take leave to join issue. Where only one definite mode of slaughter is recognized, animals that have come to their death in any other way may, I think, legitimately be regarded as coming under the category of Nevelah.

Again, as to the connotation of Terefah. Does it make the slightest difference whether an ox has had its vitals torn by a wild beast or whether it was mortally injured by fire or poison? In each of these cases we have a lesion sufficient to cause death, and render the flesh unfit for food. On the other hand, an animal about to succumb to old age may have perfectly healthy organs. Its flesh will possibly be tough but not necessarily unwholesome. A person with a nice taste would not care to partake of it, but there is no reason why it should be prohibited if the animal has been properly slaughtered and found free from disease. This disposes of the strange case which excites Mr. Montefiore's natural astonishment (end of second paragraph, p. 402). The Biblical peg on which the traditional Law of Schechitah is hung is the text: "*Thou shalt slaughter as I commanded thee.*" The phrase "as I commanded thee," implies an oral law, contemporaneous with the written law. Analogy with ancient and modern legislations proves that contemporaneously with the Lex Scripta the Lex Non-Scripta must have developed. Early Roman Law was preserved in the Pontifical College by means of oral traditions which the Twelve Tables only codified. The bulk of the English Common Law consists of customs and Judges' oral decisions — "Precedents broadening down in the process of the suns." Even the precise force and application of a new statute depends ultimately on its interpretation by the Courts. The necessity of tradition to elucidate, develop, and apply to the needs

of practical life, the brief notes, pithy statements, and leading cases of which the Pentateuchal legislation mainly consists, is an obvious truism. The definition of "work" forbidden on the Sabbath, the selection of plants "with which to rejoice on the feast of Tabernacles," the precise connotation of the "affliction of the soul," enjoined for the Day of Atonement, are all fixed by tradition. Mr. Montefiore will probably dissent from this line of reasoning. How then does he explain "And thou shalt slaughter as I commanded thee"? This phrase, he says, refers to the previous permission to eat meat without a sacrifice. So permission is expressed in Hebrew by the verb צוה, "to command"! Further comment is needless.

The traditional prohibition of milk and meat, of course, comes in for rough handling. But assuming that the text is to be taken in its absolute literal sense; could the law have been carried out without the legitimate extensive interpretation that the Rabbis have given it? Will any one venture to assert that a kid must not be boiled in its dam's milk, but may be boiled in the milk of a she-goat not its dam; that this prohibition is exclusively restricted to the *kids of the goats*, while calves may be boiled in goats' or cows' milk? Obviously, if the Pentateuchal rule had not been extended to all boiled mixtures of milk and meat, it would have remained a dead letter.

That the Dietary Laws, as we know them at present, can be traced to the days of Moses is a startling assertion. But a moment's consideration will show its intrinsic probability. If external blemishes of a slight character rendered, according to the Priestly Code¹, an animal unfit to be brought on God's altar, would tuberculous lungs not have proved a fatal disqualification? From the earliest times there must surely have been a regular system of examination of the carcass as well as a prescribed mode of slaughter²,—the progenitors of the modern systems of

¹ Lev. xxii. 19-24.

² That the mode of slaughter now practised by the Jews by a transverse

Schechitah and Bedikah. It is not pretended that the tree of Judaism has not in the course of ages increased in height and breadth, but one may fairly claim that the growth has been natural, the branches are of the same fibre as the stock and the root. The impulse to development has always been an anxious solicitude to safeguard the Divine Law. The Jewish traditions and the Jewish scriptures are both words of the living God.

M. HYAMSON.

horizontal section was ancient may derive some support from the biblical expressions *חץ שחוט*, an arrow shot forth horizontally (see Rashi and Kimchi); *והב שחוט*, "threads of gold drawn out."